

08/682483



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
08/682,483	07/17/96	CANNON	G PF01251NA

LM027081ED ACTION

PINEHART M
ART UNIT 4
PAPER NUMBER

MOTOROLA INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT: Claims 1-17 are pending.
5401, NORTH BEACH STREET MS E119
FORT WORTH, TX 76137 has been filed with the drawings which are acceptable for
examination purposes only. Format drawings are required when **DATE MAILED**: 08/18/96.

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. Please advise prior art systems for messaging in
the following application. The applicant is required to provide the

Examiner will examine the application in accordance with the indicated prior art systems which may be
 This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.
 pertinent to the question of patentability in this application in order that the Examiner may
 A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 day(s) from the date of this letter.
 Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:
 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

- Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- Notice of References Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION: A mailing as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art. Such a mailing would be patentable. Patentability shall not be negated by the fact that

- 1. Claims 1-17 are allowed. 1-17 are pending in the application.
- 5. Of the above, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as withdrawn from consideration.
- 2. Claims 82,100, in view of Morgan et al. (US 5,230,465) and M. L. Ke, Jr. (US 5,530,852) have been cancelled.
- 3. Claims none, an analogous electronic mail message delivery system, disclosed none are allowed.
- 4. Claims service 1-17 (including 104, 104, 105, 106 to receive, encode/decode) are rejected.
- 5. Claims none and priority delivery to a remote selective call transceiver none which cannot none are objected to.
- 6. Claims none are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- 9. The proposed or substitute drawings have been received on none. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation) or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on none, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed none, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).
- 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. none; filed on none.
- 13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- 14. Other

MARSHALL
EXAMINER

* A copy of this reference is being furnished to the Office. It is the
35 U.S.C. 133. Examiner, none, has been informed of this action.

Art Unit: 2756

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-17 are pending.
2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
3. The Examiner notes Applicants' discussion of various prior art systems for messaging in the background of the invention in the specification. Applicant is requested to provide the Examiner with any relevant documents pertaining to the indicated prior art systems which may be pertinent to the question of patentability in this application in order that the Examiner may properly consider the applicable prior art.
4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kane (US 5,487,100) in view of Morgan et al. (US 5,239,466) and Meske, Jr. (US 5,530,852).

Kane, an analogous electronic mail message delivery system, discloses operation to provide a server 102 with message inputs 104, 106, 108, 109 to receive email formatted messages and provide delivery to a remote selective call transceiver 134 which can originate a reply request via a communication terminal function 130, 141 (See Abstract, Fig. 1; col. 1, ln. 17 - col. 5, ln. 23). Thus, Kane discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention except for parsing retrieved information in a format configured for the receiver and directing the retrieved information to a second communication device. In that Kane operates to connect with other networks for message information, the one of ordinary skill would have looked to the related

FILE COPY

Art Unit: 2756

messaging arts for information to implement the system. Morgan et al., a related system for routing messages, discloses that it was known to provide the capability of redirecting a message to another communication device 102, 104-109 through the server 101 of a wireless communication device 112 (See Abstract; Fig. 1-3; col. 2, ln. 29 - col. 3, ln. 68). Another related system, Meske, Jr. et al., discloses that it was known to parse 400-430 information 410 at a message server 150 after retrieving 250, 220 it at the request of a user agent for presentation in a desired format at a the user's particular station 100 (Abstract; Fig. 4-5; col. 2, ln. 22 - col. 3, ln. 8; col. 5, ln. 17 - col. 6, ln. 36). Thus, the one of ordinary skill would have been aware of the teachings of the prior art for redirecting and reformatting messages for presentation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Kane's message delivery system with the message redirection function taught by Morgan et al. and the message parsing/reformatting function taught by Meske, Jr. et al., thereby resulting in the system and method of claims 1-17, since Morgan et al. suggests that forwarding capabilities are neccesary for users who travel away from their regular office location and Meske, Jr. et al. suggests that message parsing/reformatting will allow for a user device to utilize a single common display interface in order to simplify accessing different types of message information. Thus, providing a server or a selective communications transceiver either individually or in a common system operating in accordance with the claimed method of operation (as in claims 1-17) would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for in accordance with the combination of references as discussed above.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Additional references have been cited on the accompanying PTO-892 form which

Art Unit: 2756

teach various aspects of communications message systems which are similar in operation to the system disclosed in the instant application.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5358, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2756

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner Rinehart whose telephone number is (703) 305-4815. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Supervisory Primary Examiner Frank J. Asta, can be reached on (703) 305-3817. The fax phone number for the Electrical Examining Technology Center is (703) 308-9051.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Mark H. Rinehart
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2756




MARK H. RINEHART
PRIMARY EXAMINER